REMARKS

Claims 8-13 are pending in the present application and were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,678,732 (Mouko).

Claims 14-17 have been added and Claims 8-13 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that no new subject matter has been added.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 8, the Examiner states that Mouko teaches each and every limitation of Claim 8. Upon reviewing the cited reference, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect. Mouko teaches a dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP) server which dynamically allocates Internet Protocol (IP) addresses to client devices, to which host names are given, connected to a Transmission Control Protocol/ IP (TCP/IP) network, and an IP address allocating method using the same. More specifically, Mouko teaches a server allocates an IP address to each client who is one of a plurality of clients connected to the TCP/IP network on a local area network (LAN), using a dynamic host configuration protocol (DHCP). Mouko further teaches before an IP address is allocated by a DHCP function, the DHCP client (e.g., client "a") cannot unicast because there is no IP address. In other words, it is implied that a server allocates an IP address to a client device and that before the IP address is assigned to the client device, the client device does not have an IP address. Furthermore, Mouko teaches the allocated IP address is temporarily allocated and that "[i]t is indispensable to define the host name of the client 'a' in an option area of this [i.e., the

DHCPDISCOVER] message" (Column 6, Lines 17-19). This clearly illustrates that the client devices do not have an IP address before the (temporary) IP address is assigned and that the host name of the client is used for identification and that only a single (temporary) IP address is assigned to each device.

In contrast, as defined by Claim 8, each LAN device (which the Examiner apparently equates with the clients as defined by Mouko) has its own IP address regardless of whether it is assigned a unique IP address. Therefore, each LAN device can communicate with other LAN and/or Internet devices both before and after being assigned a unique IP address. For example, as taught by Claim 8, if the party's IP address is not registered in the unique IP address allocation table (i.e., the IP address used is not the unique IP address, but rather is its own IP address), the router changes the originating party's IP address to a unique IP address of the router to transmit the packet to the Internet. This is neither taught nor suggested by Mouko.

Accordingly, as a packet can be transmitted from the LAN device using either a registered unique IP address or the device's own IP address (in other words, two distinct types of IP addresses as opposed to the single IP address type as taught by Mouko can be used), the router determines whether the originating party's IP address of the packet is registered in the unique IP address allocation table. Furthermore, when the originating (i.e., the origination) party's IP address is registered in the unique IP address allocation table, the router changes the originating party's IP address (i.e., the LAN device's own IP address as opposed to the unique IP address) of the packet to a unique IP address

-8-

corresponding to the originating party's IP address, to transmit it (the packet) to the Internet. These steps, either alone or in combination, are neither taught nor suggested by Mouko.

Accordingly, as Mouko does not teach each and every limitation of Claim 8, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of Claim 8 be withdrawn.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claim 10, Claim 10 is a system claim incorporating the steps recited in Claim 8 and is believed to be allowable at least for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to Claim 8. Moreover, in addition to the reasons stated above with respect to the rejection of Claim 8, Claim 10 includes recitation of a LAN device, connected to a router, for sending a request for a unique IP address allocation to the router, when an Internet application is started and it is determined that it is necessary to use a unique IP address, performing the application after receiving an allocated unique IP address from the router, which is also neither taught nor suggested by Mouko.

Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 11-13 are dependent upon Claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are believed to be allowable at least for their dependency from an allowable base claim. Additionally, new Claims 14 - 17 contain recitations similar to those contained in Claims

8-13 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent Claims 8, 10, and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 9, 11-13, and 15-17, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 9 and 11-13 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 8-17, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/VAG:ml

-10-